THE BRETHREN'S EVANGELIST
A Religious Weekly,
Having the BIBLE for its Creed.

H. R. HOLSINGER, - - - Editor.
E. L. YODER, - - - Office Editor.

ASHLAND, O., OCT. 29, 1884.

SPECIAL DIRECTIONS FOR

Ordering the Brethren's Evangelist and Books, and Sending Money:

In all cases write the name of each subscriber, post-office, county and State plainly.

Also, post-office, county, State and name of the writer of the letter.

In ordering a change of address, always give the name of the person, post-office, county and State where the paper is going, and where it is to go after the change.

If anything is written for the editor, or for publication, it must be on a separate sheet of paper from that on which the names of subscribers, or orders for books, are written.

The money should accompany all orders for books or papers.

Money may be sent by Express, Postal Money Order, Bank Draft, Postal Note or Registered Letter, at our risk.

We will be pleased at any time to correct any and all errors occurring in this office.

While we shall endeavor to fill all orders promptly and correctly, we must decline to duplicate any books which may be lost on the road to their destination.

The subscription of the BRETHREN'S EVANGELIST is $2.00 a year, in advance.

New subscriptions may commence at any time during the year, but we cannot agree to furnish back numbers.

The BRETHREN'S EVANGELIST will be sent only till the term of subscription expires, unless otherwise ordered.

Agents are allowed to retain ten per cent. of our money for their services.

All letters and communications to be addressed,

H. R. HOLSINGER & CO.,
Ashland, Ohio.

TAKE NOTICE.

We offer the EVANGELIST from now on to the close of the volume for twenty-five cents. We make this offer as an inducement to those who would like to try our paper on a small scale. We solicit all our subscribers to exert themselves in our behalf, and in behalf of the Brethren cause, by publishing this statement to such who possibly might be influenced to subscribe, and soliciting them to do so at once and get the benefit of this offer. Remember that it is only through the INFLUENCE OF OUR FRIENDS that we can expect to increase our circulation.

"HERE A LITTLE AND THERE A LITTLE."

The latest thought that has impressed me is, that it will require only two hundred men to give one hundred dollars each, to raise the $20,000 to pay the indebtedness of Ashland College. Surely there are two hundred men in the Brethren church who can give one hundred dollars each, in three equal annual payments. We now have the half, and hence will need only one hundred more. Are there not one hundred more persons in the church who are as well able to donate a hundred dollars to that purpose as P. J. Brown and H. R. Holsinger, who have subscribed that amount? If we could have just fifty more one hundred dollar men, we believe we could raise the other five thousand dollars by fifty dollars, and smaller donations. Brethren and sisters, please send in your names for one hundred dollars. If any who have made smaller donations wish to increase their subscribtions to one hundred dollars, please send in your names and we will send a new note filled up in accordance. We now have about thirty one hundred dollar donations, including those which exceed that amount. Let us have a "Centenary Band." A contribution of one hundred dollars or more to the payment of the debt of Ashland College will entitle the donor to be enrolled in the Band. All who wish to join will please rise and give their names.

Some little things become magnified by being dwelt upon at great length. Witness the above item.

It is currently reported in some places in the west that Enoch Eby has gone to see Elder Stein. we place no confidence in the report.

There is a German Baptist Elder in Kansas, whom the people call Billygish, who is in the habit of alluding to the editor of this paper in his sermons, and that not very flatteringly. He should be a little careful of his own reputation, if he has no care for us.

The Communion meetings in the Falls City, Nebraska, and Pony Creek, Kansas, churches, were very orderly and pleasant occasions. The feast at Falls City was the first German Baptist communion in which we have been permitted to participate since the Arnold's Grove conference.

Will not some one please favor us with an account of the proceedings of the District meeting of the Southern district of Illinois? Would like to know how brethren Vaniman and Gibson fared in their cases. Did they retract, make acknowledgement, or maintain their liberty? Who knows and will dare to tell the naked truth?

H. R. HOLSINGER.

It is rather disparaging to the zeal and energy of the churches when they allow the politicians to so absorb the public mind as to detract from the interest of religious meetings. The subjects of Christ's kingdom should find means to excite as much interest in behalf of King Emmanuel as any partisans can do in behalf of their leaders. We fear that the fault lies more with the ministers and members than with the congregations.

SOME THOUGHTS ON ELDER QUINTER'S THOUGHTS ON FURNITURE.

Our readers will please read Elder James Quinter's article in another page of the EVANGELIST, and find what we have found.

We have found that Elder Quinter upon this occasion has not confined his remarks very closely to the text. This, we know, is not characteristic of Elder Quinter. We have heard him preach frequently, and have always heretofore found him abundantly able to handle his subject with due regard to his text, and preach therefrom a logical discourse. W suppose the reason he does not confine himself to his text upon this occasion is because he happened upon a very poor text. We heard of a minister preaching from the text: "Goat's Milk," and we thought that was odd and difficult, but we believe we could get along better with that than with "The musical instrument as household furniture" text.

Yet we believe Elder Q. might have done better with his text than he did if he would have been really in earnest about having the instruments used in that way. He might have told us about converting the organ into a sink, or the piano into a bedstead, or the violin into a clock, or the trombone into a dinner horn; and he would then have been preaching from his text and been as apt in his illustration as the Prophet was when he prophesied that the swords were to be turned into plough-shares and the spears into pruning-hooks; and would also have been as much in harmony with the class for whose benefit he was writing, as the prophecy is with the doctrine of nonresistance.

It seems to us that Elder Quinter intended his *text* for brother Harshbarger and his school of thinker, and his *sermon* for James Quinter, the Huntingdon Normal College, the Philadelphia church, and all who believe with David of old, in using musical instruments "In the service of God," and wherewith to "Praise the Lord".

We are bound to believe, out of respect for Elder Quinter, that he uses his organ in this way, and not for a mere sensual gratification as a glutton or a drunkard enjoys the indulgence of his appetite, though it is evident that he does not want his brother Harshbarger to believe that he is "*opposing his views*" when he (brother H.,) writes in opposition to musical instruments as a means of worship, but would rather have his dear brother believe that the brethren who desire musical instruments (including himself, of course,) do so "That they may have them in their houses for the entertainment and gratification of such that are entertained and gratified by them." And as he further explains, this gratification is not "gratification" "differing in principle" from the "gratification of the palate or taste." We have said we do not want to believe that Elder Quinter has no higher use for the organ than this, out of respect to his *devotion* and *self denial* as a Christian, and we wish we knew how to apologize for the attitude in which this charitable construction of his language still leaves him.

We believe for our part that if a musical instrument cannot be used to the *honor and glory of God* it should not be used at all; and the same is also true of eating and drinking, because a greater than Quinter has said, "Whether therefore, ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." 1 Cor. 10: 31.

The second division under the text and *from* it, is, if possible, more remote from household furniture than the firstly. A heading something like this would have been a far more appropriate text for this part of his subject, viz:

THE INCONSISTENCY OF THE UNIFORMITY IN NON CONFORMITY DOCTRINE.

But that would have been too much after the style of Holsinger, Bashor, or Brown, and might have caused trouble. Elder Quinter is mild in his expressions so as to give no offense. Where Saylor would say "Rebels", Quinter says "Separatists," and where Holsinger and others would call white, white, and black, black, Quinter prefers to handle the uniformity in non-conformity doctrine under the head of household furniture. That is what constitutes the difference between men, causing the one to be classed among Christians and the others among heathens and publicans. But is such the judgment of a just and righteous God? No, thank God! It is only the judgment of a human tribunal known as an expelling committee.

His thirdly under the Household Furniture text would read better under the head of

INCONSISTENCY.

In this department J. Q. tells us about some who separated themselves or "went off from the Brotherhood with the Miami Separatists" on account of a pool baptism, but now a similar baptism is performed by these same Miami separatists, and is acknowledged by the Vindicator as all right. How is this brother Vindicator? Have you, too, got some conservative ways about you? We hope to hear from you on this subject. We had all confidence in your honesty and consistency before, but this little tale that Elder Quinter tells about you, would seem to indicate that you, too, can be somewhat plastic.

Since, however, Elder Quinter has taken the liberty to politely remind you of your shortcomings, we hope he will not take it amiss if we ask him a few briet questions in order to make clear to us a few things in his career that have been somewhat mysterious to us. We have always entertained great respect for Elder Quinter's piety and conscientiousness, so much so, that any act of his that *seemed* inconsistent with his profession as a Christian has had the tendency to injure us, inasmuch as we felt that if brother Quinter was *not* a Christian we would not know to whom we could append that characteristic with any assurance that we had not misplaced our confidence. Our feelings in regard to Elder Quinter in this respect were similar to those described to us by a beloved brother from Mt. Morris, Illinois, in regard to Elder J. W. Stine. He said that he had such great confidence in Stine, that since he was disappointed in him, he felt that he could never trust any living man with absolute certainty. Now that is the way we must feel if Elder Quinter cannot explain his conduct in the following particulars, which we respectfully ask him to do.

1st. How could you consistently commune with Elder J. B. Wampler, of Armstrong county, Pa., who, to your certain knowledge, had fellowshipped Holsinger after the Arnold's Grove meeting, and had taken part in the Ashland convention, and was a member of its most important committee, after you had been to Ohio and had there assisted in disfellowshipping Mason, Bailey, Meyers, Roop and others, for the same offense of which brother Wampler was also guilty?

2nd. How can you now, through your journal, claim the churches known as the Eastern churches, including Coventry, Green Tree, and Philadelphia, as loyal to annual meeting, when you are well aware that they have fellowshipped Holsinger and are no more in harmony with annual meeting than the churches which you assisted in expelling for disloyalty to that power? You are well aware that these churches, and especially the Philadelphia church, pay no attention to the minutes of annual meeting. You know that the latter church has a pool and uses it, contrary to the decisions of annual meeting, which decisions you were, among others, appointed to enforce; and you know, too, that they have a paid ministry and an organ in connection with church services and that there is scarcely a member in the church from the pastor down who dresses in the order of the church prescribed by annual meeting. How can you hold them in fellowship and claim them as being loyal to annual meeting, after you have assisted in the work of expelling other churches and other members who had done no more, nor as much? How can you, consistenly with the rules to which you claim to owe fealty, and the Gospel of Christ which teaches that Christians should not have respect to persons, discharge your duties as elder thus partially and with so much respect to persons and churches. You meet with some of your former brethren to whom you deny the kiss of charity offered to you, though they are guilty of no greater offense than others whom you salute and fellowship. Is this right? You have pronounced judgment upon some because of violations of which you yourself are equally guilty—refusal to respect decisions of annual meeting. Is this right? Is it consistent? If so, will you not tell us where in the Gospel of the merciful Son of God, you have found an example, or a precept, or a principle, which you can designate as a justification of the course you have pursued.

We shall cover your conduct with a mantle of charity until you have had time to make reply in explanation of your course.

The *American Christian Review*, reviews an article on feet washing that some one of his subscribers has sent him, which was clipped from the *Brethren at Work* and written by J. W. Southey. The review is decidedly thin as is evidenced by the summing up or conclusion, which is as follows:

"In conclusion, we ask our Tunker brethren, How did you find out that in the Apostolic age the men washed only the men's feet? and that the women washed only the women's feet? and that only one foot of each person was washed instead of two? and the right foot and not the left foot? and the feet washed at home as preparatory to feetwashing? And where is your command or example for dressing up in uniform at the time of observing the ordinance?

We spare our readers by giving no more than the conclusion.

"The Emperor of Austria has the finest collection of pipes in Europe," is the interesting and startling news that is now published over the world. The emperor must certainly be a very talented and wise ruler, to have been able to accomplish such a wonderful thing. His nation should be proud of him.

DR. FAHRNEY'S OLD ORDERISM REVIEWED.

The reader, in another column of this issue, will find an article by Dr. P. Fahrney, of Chicago, on "Old Orderism." The doctor claims that his definition of "Old Order" applies to the views entertained by brethren in the days of Alexander Mack and his immediate successors. We always thought that the "Old Order" which the doctor defines and describes was conceived, born and matured, a quarter of a century later, and that Mack had nothing do with its paternity or nurturing. We always believed that the "Old Order" which Mack taught was the Apostolic Order, and this is the kind of Order we believe in and advocate. We believe there is quite a difference in the two Orders. We are willing to follow Mack, as far as he followed the Gospel, and *it* is the only order we can defend. We believe that pure and undefiled religion teaches that we should not only "*not*" "Begrudge the heathen his education," nor be satisfied by *not belittleing* the efforts of temperance societies, but that it teaches that its possessor should be "concerned about the welfare of his fellow-man," as an evidence of his own reformation and as one of the ways for him to let his light shine.

The gospel teaches "The Universal Brotherhood of man, and pure and undefiled religion is founded on love to God and love to our fellow man. The *love* which in pure and undefiled religion, prompts a visitation to the "widow and fatherless" is not confined to that class *alone* in its ministrations but will extend to all who are in need, and in affliction. Neither does this love confine itself to administer to the *temporal wants* of our needy fellowman, but his spiritual wants also. The same love which will prompt the child of God to share his temporal good with the needy, will also prompt him to an effort to carry the Bible and the blessings of the Christian civilization, which he enjoys, to lands that are destitute of its light and whose people are famishing for the bread of life. Pure and undefiled religion not only *does not make any objections* when others are making visits of love and are using means to restrain vice and better the condition of humanity but it wants to *help to prosecute* such great and noble works. The sword of the Spirit is moreover a *double edged* sword. The Christian soldier must not only be prepared to prosecute a *defensive* warfare but *offensive* as well. He must not only be prepared to defend himself and the cause of Christ from the attacks of the enemy but he must go forth with "his feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace" and attack and *pull down* the strongholds of satan.

The Christian's *accomplishment* should not only consist of *knowing*, but his chief glory should be in *doing* the will of his heavenly father. It is the will of the Father who delegated all power to the Son that his disciples should go and teach all nations. There are some things that individual members can do as such, and which it necessary and required for them to do; but there is much that is required of the *church* that can best be done by the combined efforts of all the members of the church. The carrying of the gospel into other lands is one of these. It might be possible for a man of great wealth to translate the bible and carry it to foreign shores, but it is not the way it is generally done, nor is it the plan contemplated by the gospel. All the members of the one body are equally responsible to do their part toward accomplishing the great work of bringing the world to a knowledge of Christ. It would not be practicable for all to attend to this work personally, but when there is an organized effort for the accomplishment of this or any other work, all can assist.

One man, if he is wealthy, can build a meeting house and furnish it, but in most cases it takes the combined efforts of a congregation to do a work of this kind. If a minister of the gospel is wealthy he can devote all his time to preaching, and may accomplish much good, but in such a case the congregation would deprived from a privilege, and hindered in the performance of a duty. In every work of this kind all should be encouraged to assist, and the burden or privilege should not be entailed on one or a few.

The Doctor's illustration about the wheat is good as far as it goes. Wheat must not be ground if you want to use it for seed to perpetuate its own existance, but the chief use of wheat is to make bread to sustain the life of man. Viewing it in this light its vitality is *not destroyed* by being ground and combined.

Paul compares Christians to wheat in this form, 1 Cor. 10: 16. For we being many are one bread and one body. The unity of the church is symbolized by the bread of communion which is made of different grains of wheat crushed and combined.

We firmly believe that if "Old order" would have striven to *combine their efforts* in the way suggested above, to spread the gospel, establish schools, missions, and asylums for the mendicant instead of vainly attempting to establish uniformity in dress, as an outward show of personal holiness, it would have accomplished immensely